



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,617	08/19/2003	Kyo Young Chung	YBST-0001P1P1	3768
34610	7590	03/29/2005	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			LE, JOHN H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2863	
DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.A

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/642,617

Applicant(s)

CHUNG, KYO YOUNG

Examiner

John H. Le

Art Unit

2863

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 7, "(" and ")" should avoid.

Claim 7, line 6, "(" and ")" should avoid.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 7-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kang et al. (USP 6,466,882).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Kang et al. disclose a method of improving defect detection accuracy of an electrode array testing system (e.g. Col.2, lines 39-43), wherein the electrode array defines a plurality of pixels and wherein the electrode array testing system determines if a pixel is defective based on at least one thresholding parameter (short states of data line)(e.g. Col.2, lines 24-55), comprising: defining a critical number of defects (e.g. 3, lines 58-65); comparing a number of defects reported by the electrode array testing system to the critical number of defects (e.g. comparator, Col.4, lines 48-58, Col.8, lines 35-50).

Art Unit: 2863

Kang et al. do not teach adjusting the at least one thresholding parameter if the number of reported defects is greater than the critical number of defects. Kang et al., however, disclose the comparator retrieves data on defects stored in the file server. The comparator compares the cumulative data retrieved from the server with the data collected in the current process that has been transferred from the defect detector. If any difference is found, an appropriate change is made to the data, which is now referred to as stack data (Col.8, lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include "If any difference is found, an appropriate change is made to the data, which is now referred to as stack data" is considered substitute as claimed.

Regarding claims 2-3, and 8-9, Kang et al. do not teach the at least one thresholding parameter is adjusted until the number of reported defects is less than or equal to the critical number of defects. Kang et al., however, disclose the comparator retrieves data on defects stored in the file server. The comparator compares the cumulative data retrieved from the server with the data collected in the current process that has been transferred from the defect detector. If any difference is found, an appropriate change is made to the data, which is now referred to as stack data (Col.8, lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include "If any difference is found, an appropriate change is made to the data, which is now referred to as stack data" is considered substitute as claimed.

Art Unit: 2863

Regarding claims 5 and 11, Kang et al. teach the critical number of defects correspond to a number of defects at which a repair attempt is not made (e.g. Col.4, lines 1-7, Col.6, lines 39-43).

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Kang et al. do not teach alerting a cell and/or module inspection station if the number of reported defects is greater than the critical number of defects. Kang et al., however, disclose codes of the defects indicating the contents of the defects and the cell grades indicating defective status (Col.3, lines 62-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include "the cell grades indicating defective status" is considered substitute as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

In combination with other limitations of the claims, the cited prior arts fails to teach incrementally adjusting the at least one thresholding parameter by a first increment value until the number of reported defects is less than the critical number of defects to yield a first thresholding parameter value; subtracting one increment value from the first thresholding parameter value to yield a second thresholding parameter value; and incrementally adjusting the second thresholding parameter value by a second increment value until the number of

Art Unit: 2863

reported defects is less than the critical number of defects to yield an final thresholding parameter value; wherein the second increment value is smaller than the first increment value, as recited in claim(s) 4 and 10.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John H Le whose telephone number is 571-272-2275. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John H. Le

Patent Examiner-Group 2863

March 21, 2005


John Barlow
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800